UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/421,363	10/19/1999	GEE-GWO MEI	YO999-349	4029

21254   7590   02/28/2003

MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER
ANWAH, OLISA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2645	

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.</td><td>Applicant(s)</td></tr>
<tr><td>09/421,363</td><td>MEI ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner</td><td>Art Unit</td></tr>
<tr><td>Olisa Anwah</td><td>2645</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12/23/2002</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which

forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this

Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
> disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at
> the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the
> art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-9, 12, 15-19, 21-23 and 26-32 are rejected under

35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson, U.S. Patent

No. 6,016,336 (hereinafter Hanson) in view of Wolf, U.S. Patent

No. 5,737,393 (hereinafter Wolf) in further view of Polcyn et

al, U.S. Patent No. 6,061,433 (hereinafter Polcyn).

Regarding claim 1, Hanson discloses a method for

personalizing an interactive voice response system to reduce a

number of key sequences to reach a desired source of

information, comprising storing a caller profile and retrieving

the caller profile to construct a personalized IVR dialogue menu

and play out the personalized menu (see Figure 5, col. 2, lines

45-46 and col. 4, lines 9-17).

Hanson does not disclose the personalized IVR dialogue is

at least one of based on a caller access pattern and

configurable by the caller. However Wolf discloses the
personalized IVR dialogue is configurable by the caller (col. 3,
lines 28-30 and col. 1, lines 60-64). Therefore it would have
been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to modify Hanson wherein the personalized IVR
dialogue menu is configurable by said caller as taught by Wolf.
This modification provides an IVR system that may be customized
by a user to overcome or reduce disadvantages and limitations
associated with prior methods and systems as suggested by Wolf
(col. 1, lines 60-64).

Hanson modified by Wolf does not disclose the personalized
IVR dialogue is based on a caller access pattern. However Polcyn
discloses the personalized IVR dialogue is based on a caller
access pattern (col. 1, lines 12-20). Therefore it would have
been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to further modify Hanson modified with Wolf
wherein the personalized IVR dialogue menu is based on a caller
access patter as taught by Wolf. This modification provides a
reduction in the average duration of incoming telephone calls
without relying on the memory or abilities of callers as
suggested by Polcyn (col. 2, lines 31-33).

Regarding claim 2, see Polcyn, col. 2, lines 66-67.

Regarding claim 3, see Polcyn, col. 6, lines 59-64.

Regarding claim 4, see Polcyn, col. 1, lines 12-20.

Regarding claim 5, see Hanson, col. 4, lines 12-14.

Regarding claim 6, see Polcyn, col. 4, lines 34-44.

Regarding claim 7, see Polcyn, col. 3, lines 42-49.

Regarding claim 8, see Hanson, col. 3, lines 1-4.

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8.

Regarding claim 12, see Hanson col. 5, lines 1-7.

Regarding claim 15, see Hanson, col. 3, lines 9-10 and col. 4, lines 9-17.

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 17, see Hanson, col. 4, lines 9-14.

Regarding claim 18, see Hanson, col. 4, lines 1-3 and col. 3, lines 1-4.

Regarding claim 19, see Wolf, col. 1, line 61, col. 3, lines 16-20 and lines 28-30, col. 5, lines 2-3, col. 4, lines 34-37 and col. 6, line 42.

Regarding claim 21, see Polcyn, col. 2, lines 50-56.

Regarding claim 22, see Polcyn, col. 8, lines 5-16.

Regarding claim 23, see Polcyn, col. 6, lines 59-64.

Claim 27 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 18.

Claim 28 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 16.

Regarding claim 29, see Hanson column 4.

Claim 30 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 29.

Claim 31 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 30.

Claim 32 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 31.

3.   Claims 10, 11, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §
103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson combined with Wolf and
Polcyn in further view of Wu, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,042
(hereinafter Wu).

Regarding claim 10, Hanson combined with Wolf and Polcyn
does not disclose displaying to said caller said IVR menu to
reduce a number of key sequences during interactions. However Wu
discloses displaying to a caller an IVR menu to reduce a number
of key sequences during interactions (col. 4, lines 50-66).
Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in
the art at the time the invention was made to further modify
Hanson combined with Wolf and Polcyn to include displaying to
said caller said IVR menu to reduce a number of key sequences
during interactions as taught by Wu. This modification allows
service providers to serve both callers and PC users using an
existing voice response system as suggested by Wu.

Regarding claim 11, see Hanson, col. 3, lines 47-48.

Regarding claim 24, Hanson combined with Wolf and Polcyn
does not disclose the limitation of "a dialogue automatic
playout module for allowing personalized access of information
by said caller, wherein if said caller decides to use a

personalized shortcut unique to said caller, control sequences

representing said shortcut are input to said dialogue automatic

playout module". However Wu discloses the claimed limitation

(see column 4). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

further modify Hanson combined with Wolf and Polcyn to include a

dialogue automatic playout module for allowing personalized

access of information by a caller, wherein if the caller decides

to use personalized shortcut unique to said caller, control

sequences representing said shortcut are input to said dialogue

automatic playout module as taught by Wu. This modification

allows service providers to serve both callers and PC users

using as existing voice response system as suggested by Wu.

Regarding claim 25, Hanson combined with Wolf and Polcyn as

applied in claim 16 does not disclose the following limitation,

"a personalized menu processor module for constructing said

shortcut for the personalized menus specified by the caller,

wherein specification is selectively performed over one of a

telephone interaction and a world-wide network and once

specified by said caller, the personalized menu is represented

by one of a list of direct dialogue paths to desired information

and a hierarchical dialogue menu". However Wu discloses the

claimed limitation (see column 4). Therefore it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Hanson combined with Polcyn and Wolf to include a personalized menu processor module for constructing a shortcut for the personalized menus specified by said caller, wherein specification is selectively performed over one of a telephone interaction and a world-wide network and once specified by said caller, the personalized menu is represented by one of a list of direct dialogue paths to desired information and a hierarchical dialogue menu as taught by Wu. This modification allows service providers to serve both callers and PC users using an existing voice response system as suggested by Wu.

4.   Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson combined with Wolf and Polcyn in further view of Csaszar, U.S. Patent No. 5,970,124 (hereinafter Csaszar).

Regarding claim 13, Hanson combined Wolf and Polcyn does not disclose inserting an advertisement into said caller's personalized dialogue menu, based on the caller's IVR past accessing patterns, during said caller's navigation of said personalized IVR dialogue. However Csaszar discloses inserting an advertisement into a caller's personalized dialogue menu, based on the caller's IVR past accessing patterns, during said

caller's navigation of said personalized IVR dialogue (col. 8,
lines 55-67 and col. 9, lines 1-13). Therefore it would have
been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to further modify
Hanson combined with Wolf and Polcyn to include inserting an
advertisement into a caller's personalized dialogue menu, based
on the caller's IVR past accessing patterns, during said
caller's navigation of said personalized IVR dialogue as taught
by Csaszar. This modification provides advertisers and marketers
with the ability to better direct advertisements to customers
who are most interested in a product or service as suggested by
Csaszar.

Regarding claim 14, see Csaszar, col. 8, lines 55-67 and
col. 9, lines 1-22.

5.   Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Hanson combined with Wolf and Polcyn in
further view of Juster, U.S. Patent No. 5,724,406 (hereinafter
Juster).

Regarding claim 20, Hanson combined with Wolf and Polcyn as
applied in claim 16 does not disclose the following limitation,
"a dialogue handler, coupled to receive an input from said
caller, for modeling state transitions of said system, to
provide an output, the output of said dialogue handler module
determining a message to be returned to said caller, and an

input of said dialogue handler module being derived from a

caller input via at least one of a predetermined tone and a

voice message from said caller". However Juster discloses the

claimed limitation (see columns 2, 5 and 13). Therefore it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to further modify Hanson combined

with Wolf and Polcyn to include a dialogue handler, coupled to

receive an input from the caller, for modeling state transitions

of said system, to provide an output, the output of said

dialogue handler module determining a message to be returned to

said caller, and an input of said dialogue handler module being

derived from a caller input via at least one of a predetermined

tone and a voice message from a caller as taught by Juster. This

modification provides a flexible call processor to be used in a

wide range of multi-media messaging environments to provide any

number/type of messaging service as suggested by Juster.

6.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hanson in view of Wolf.

    Regarding claim 26, Hanson discloses a system for

personalizing an interactive voice response system to reduce an

umber of key sequences to reach a desired source of information,

comprising a storage for storing a caller profile and a

retrieval unit for retrieving the caller's profile to construct

a personalized IVR dialogue menu and play-out the personalized

menu, wherein the retrieval unit is selectively interfaced with

a network and a PSTN (see Figure 5, col. 2, lines 45-46 and col.

4, lines 9-17).

Hanson does not disclose the limitation where "the

retrieval unit includes a telephone interface module for

selectively interfacing with the PSTN and for selectively

receiving a predetermined tone and a voice input from said

caller via the PSTN, the telephone interface module selectively

transmitting at least one of synthesized and stored voice

messages to said caller via the PSTN, wherein the personalized

IVR dialogue menu is configurable by said caller through the

PSTN via the telephone interface module, wherein said network

interface module presents a configurable menu to the caller via

the network for the caller to specify the caller's personalized

dialogue menu, wherein the network interface module parses text

messages into a predetermined format such that the parsed text

messages are used to interact with the caller through said

telephone interface module". However, Wolf discloses the claimed

limitation (see column 1 and columns 4-6). Therefore it would

have been obvious to modify Hanson where the retrieval unit

includes a telephone interface module for selectively

interfacing with the PSTN and for selectively receiving a

predetermined tone and a voice input from said caller via the

PSTN, the telephone interface module selectively transmitting at

least one of synthesized and stored voice messages to said

caller via the PSTN, wherein the personalized IVR dialogue menu

is configurable by said caller through the PSTN via the

telephone interface module as taught by Wolf. This modification

provides an IVR system that may be customized by a user.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant argues none of the cited references disclose

"wherein said personalized IVR dialogue menu is at least one of

based on a caller access pattern and configurable by said

caller". However Wolf teaches a personalized IVR dialogue menu

configurable by a caller, while Polcyn discloses a personalized

IVR dialogue menu based on a caller access pattern.

Applicant further argues while Polcyn tracks the usage of

final applications; Polcyn does not track the paths to

applications. However applicant does not claim "tracking paths

to an application". Applicant claims the "personalized IVR

dialogue menu is based on a caller access pattern". Polcyn

teaches presenting a personalized menu based on a historical

record of past usage of applications. A historical record of

past usage of applications is the same as a caller access

pattern because the historical record is a pattern showing the

past applications that a caller has accessed. Therefore Polcyn
teaches the claimed limitation.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier
communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa
Anwah whose telephone number is 703-305-4814. The examiner can
normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are
unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be
reached on 703-305-4895. The fax phone numbers for the
organization where this application or proceeding is assigned
are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for
After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status
of this application or proceeding should be directed to the
receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Olisa Anwah
Patent Examiner
February 19, 2003

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600